UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,378	01/27/2004	Mark S. Secrist	200313705-1	1596

22879   7590   08/03/2007
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
HASSAN, RASHEDUL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/765,378	SECRIST ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Rashedul Hassan	2179	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 May 2007</u>.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.
　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some *　c) ☐ None of:
　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anuff et

al. (US 6,327,628) hereinafter Anuff.

For claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20 and 22-25, Anuff teaches a computer

implemented system and corresponding method comprising:

determining a construction design for an adapted portal application wherein said

determining a construction design includes one or more of:

determining a visual theme of said adapted portal application (determining

a visual theme means determining the look and feel of the portal

application, column 2 lines 13-16, also subsection 8-8.6); and

determining a format of content for said adapted portal application

(content is formatted in a predetermined layout, Abstract and column 2

lines 1-3, also subsection "3.4 page layout");

determining a model for separation or presentation logic and application logic of an existing Web application to be adapted into said portal application (Anuff teaches that the views are the means by which the portal server isolates the presentation logic from the application logic, subsection 3.3.2);

determining a navigation construction for said adapted portal application wherein said determining a navigation construction includes:

retrieving selected information based on an event defined by uniform resource locator (URL) interaction in said Web application (Fig. 2 shows various URLs that are usable to retrieve selected information based on an event such as clicking a URL, also link 22 as mentioned in column 3 lines 52-54);

selecting a level of customization to apply to said adapted portal application wherein said selecting a level of customization comprises one or more of:

presenting an interactive window to obtain customization information from a user (buttons or links 24 in Fig. 2 are used to launch an interactive window that allow the user to personalize the portal, column 3 lines 52-57), wherein said obtained customization information is stored in a portal framework (LDAP directory or SQL database shown in Fig. 3, column 9 lines 30-34, also column 13 lines 25-30); and

retrieving existing login information related to said user for inclusion in

content of said adapted portal application (column 9 lines 30-34, also

column 13 lines 25-30);

selecting an isolation model for isolating business logic from said adapted portal

application wherein said selecting an isolation model comprises one or more of:

modifying said business model to return output as at least one data-

descriptive meta language document (column 10 lines 52-62); and

creating a component to connect said adapted portal application to one or

more Web services for providing said business logic to said adapted portal

application (the server part of the portal server shown in Fig. 3, column 4

lines 16-33); and

employing the determined construction design, the determined model, the

determined navigation construction, the selected level of customization, and the

selected isolation model for adapting said existing Web application into said

portal application in a manner that maintains said existing Web application's

functionality within said portal application (implied in the reference since such

employment is necessary in order to realize the disclosed portal infrastructure

that is intended to maintain the existing Web application's functionality within the

modular portal infrastructure but in a streamlined and cost effective manner

(c1:40:62).

For claims 6,11 and 21, Anuff teaches adapting a web application to a portal application comprising:

adding at least one component of said Web application to a portal platform (Fig. 2 shows various components of a web application such as Search, Company Directory, News and Discussion Boards that are added to a portal platform);

creating a plurality of portlets within said portal platform, wherein each of said plurality includes pages representing a view for said at least one component of said Web application (each module displayed on the portal front page as shown in Fig. 2 is a portlet that contains pages representing a view for a particular network resource);

defining at least one Web flow relationship representing interactions between said at least one component of said Web application (defining at least one Web flow relationship is inherent in the reference since there has to be a defined Web flow relationship in order to show the appropriate page based on the user interaction at the portal, Fig. 2); and

converting said at least one Web flow relationship into at least one event, defined within said plurality of portlets, wherein said at least one event corresponds to said interactions (Anuff teaches implementing the defined Web flow relationship

by converting it into user selection events such as selecting a link or button in order to display appropriate page based on the selection, Fig. 2).

For claim 16, Anuff further teaches displaying a second user interface to a user for updating the personal login information ("Edit Account" link in Fig. 2).

Response to Arguments

The Examiner acknowledges and appreciates the amendments and arguments filed on 05/25/2007.

Based on Applicant's amendment to the Drawings and Specification, previous objections to the Drawings and Specification are hereby withdrawn. Previous objection to claim 5 for minor informality is also hereby withdrawn based on Applicant's amendment.

Applicant's arguments, see page 13 lines 24-35, filed on 05/25/2007, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter have been withdrawn.

However, Applicant's arguments, filed on 05/25/2007, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Anuff have been fully considered and are not persuasive. The rejections of claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Anuff have been maintained.

For claim 1, Applicant argues, "while Anuff proposes a modular portal infrastructure or framework, Anuff fails to address any technique for adapting an existing Web application into the proposed portal infrastructure" (Applicant's Remarks: p15: 21-23). The Examiner disagrees. It appears that the Applicant relies on the fact that Anuff does not disclose adapting <u>an instance of an implementation</u> of a Web application into a portal infrastructure. The Examiner realizes that Anuff does not explicitly teach a technique that takes coded components, in other words an instance of an implementation, of a Web application and modify or incorporate those coded components to form corresponding modules to be used in its portal framework, although such modification would have been obvious based on his teachings. But such limitation is not required by the claim as it is drafted at present. A "Web application" as recited in the claim, can reasonably be interpreted, in the broadest reasonable interpretation, to mean a concept of a Web application. For example, just the concept of searching the web with a keyword for retrieving information relevant to the keyword can be broadly referred to as a Web application, even though this concept can be implemented using various different techniques as various different instances of implementation of the Web application. Therefore, "an existing Web application" as recited in the claim can reasonably be interpreted to mean "a known concept of a Web application" and not necessarily be interpreted to be an existing instance of a particular implementation of a Web application. Interpreted as such, claim 1 only requires a method for adapting a known concept of a Web application into a portal infrastructure using the steps recited. Note that the claim does not need that an existing instance of an implementation be

present and modified or incorporated or adapted into the portal infrastructure. In other words, the portal infrastructure can be implemented from scratch if needed. Therefore, "an existing Web application to be adapted into said portal application" only requires use of a known concept of a Web application and to make it suitable to or fit for a specific use or situation (American Heritage Dictionary defines the word "adapt" as "To make suitable to or fit for a specific use or situation") by implementing the concept as a portal framework. Such a portal framework is thus an "adapted portal application" as recited in claim 1. Anuff teaches a modular portal infrastructure that uses the existing concepts of browser applications (e.g., Web applications such as web search, company directory search, News etc. as shown in Fig. 2) and adapts those application concepts to meet the desire of today's corporate users "to have quick access to various resources and data provided by the employer, while at the same time being able to view information provided over the internet, such as news headlines, financial data, and vendor data" (c3:36-39) at once from a single site using a portal infrastructure. Anuff further realizes that the use of a portal infrastructure to adapt existing Web application concepts into a one-site gateway to the Web was not a new concept or technique. He teaches that by the time of his invention "portals have become popular mechanisms that enable users to access information from multiple different network sites at once (c3:37-39). Therefore, even the concept of a portal infrastructure itself can be thought of as "an existing Web application" at the time of the invention. Therefore, it can be said that Anuff further teaches a technique for adapting an existing portal Web application into a modular portal infrastructure to make it suitable to or fit for the current organizational need for

streamlining the processes involved in offering a feature-rich portal while minimizing the complexity and cost of developing, deploying, administering and continually enhancing portals (c1:40-62). Therefore, Anuff clearly anticipates the claim as pointed out in this Office Action above.

> Claim 6 recites:
>
> *A method for adapting a Web application to a portal application comprising:*
>
> > *adding at least one component of said Web application to a portal platform; ..."*

For claim 6, Applicant similarly argues that "Anuff fails to disclose any technique for adapting a web application to its proposed modular portal infrastructure". It has already been pointed out above based on the interpretation of a "Web application", why the Examiner disagrees with Applicant on this point and how Anuff teaches a method for "adapting a Web application to a portal application". Recall that even the concept of a portal application itself can be thought of as "an existing Web application" at the time of the invention. Anuff clearly teaches, "within a corporate context, a user may desire to have quick access to various resources and data provided by the employer, while at the same time being able to view information provided over the Internet, such as news headlines, financial data, and vendor data. To this end, therefore, portals have become popular mechanisms that enable users to access information from multiple different network sites at once" (c3:32-29). Therefore, various components as shown in Fig. 2, such as News, Company Directory etc. are components, in other words functionalities,

used in known Web application concepts (e.g., components used in existing non-

modular portal) that are added to a portal platform of Anuff's invention.

Claim 6 further recites:

defining at least one Web flow relationship representing interactions between said at

least one component of said Web application; and

converting said at least one Web flow relationship into at least one event, defined within

said plurality of portlets, wherein said at least one event corresponds to said interactions

Regarding the above limitation, the Examiner pointed out in the previous Office

Action (which is maintained in this Office Action also) that defining at least one Web

flow relationship is inherent in the reference since there has to be a defined Web flow

relationship in order to show the appropriate page based on the user interaction at the

portal. Further, the previous Office Action asserts on page 8 thereof that Anuff teaches

implementing the defined Web flow relationship by converting it into user selection

events such as selecting a link or button in order to display appropriate page based on

the selection. However, Applicant argues, "while the operation of a given module within

Anuff's portal may support a certain flow of interaction with a user by enabling the user

to click on a hyperlink, etc., Anuff fails to disclose defining a Web flow relationship for a

Web application and converting such relationship into an event defined in a portlet of a

portal in order to adapt a Web application into such portal (e.g., in order to adapt a Web

application into a module). Indeed, the modules of Anuff may be created from scratch,

rather than attempting to adapt an existing Web application into such modules, as Anuff

provides no disclosure of any such adapting of an existing Web application into its portal

framework" (Applicant's Remark: p17:14-21). It appears that the Applicant again relies

on the fact that Anuff does not disclose adapting an instance of an implementation of a

Web application into a portal infrastructure. The Examiner realizes that Anuff does not

explicitly teach a technique that takes a coded component, in other words a component

of an instance of an implementation, of a Web application and define at least one Web

flow relationship representing interactions between said component, although such a

function would have been obvious based on his teachings. But such limitation is not

required by the claim as it is drafted at present. Note that the claim does not need that

an existing instance of an implementation of a component of a Web application be

present in order to define a Web flow relationship so that such relationship can be

converted into an event in a portlet of a portal. In other words, even when the

components of Anuff's portal infrastructure are made from scratch, and the Web flow

relationship is defined for the modules of the modular portal infrastructure, Anuff still

teaches defining at least one Web flow relationship representing interactions between at

least one component of said Web application, since these components are components

used in known Web applications that are added into the portal infrastructure as portlet

modules.

The rejections for independent claims 11 and 21 are also based on similar

rationale as discussed above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Rashedul Hassan whose telephone number is 571-272-

9481. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

(Rashedul Hassan)

WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER